

income coming from a paycheck rose to more than a half from one-third. The percentage coming from traditional cash welfare fell to 7% from 42%. Poor households get more money from the earned income tax credit, but the advantage of that income-supplement program is that recipients have to work to get the benefit.

The poor took an earnings dip when the economy went into recession at the end of the Clinton era, but data from other government reports indicate that incomes are again starting to rise faster than inflation as labor markets tighten and the current economic expansion rolls forward.

It's probably asking way too much for this dose of economic reality to slow down the class envy lobby in Washington. But it's worth a try.

Mr. ENZI. Another article I refer to is from Denver's Rocky Mountain News for April 9, 2007, "Not bad for a much-maligned economy." We keep talking about how bad the economy is. Well, it isn't bad.

Just when your mind may have been grappling with the disturbing news that Circuit City stores had fired 3,400 of their highest-paid hourly salespeople—not to trim the workforce, as you might expect, but to replace those let go with lower-paid workers—along comes the Labor Department with equally startling news, but of a positive bent.

In March, the U.S. economy added 180,000 jobs; the unemployment rate declined again, to 4.4 percent; and average hourly and weekly earnings advanced, with weekly income up 4.4 percent . . .

The article goes on to read:

But after six years of fairly steady economic growth despite a costly war, Katrina, a housing slump and other body blows, fair-minded people should at least entertain the possibility that current policies must be getting something right.

It ends by saying:

After all, what exactly is it about the March economic figures that [you] don't like?

I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Apr. 9, 2007]

NOT BAD FOR A MUCH-MALIGNED ECONOMY

Just when your mind may have been grappling with the disturbing news that Circuit City stores had fired 3,400 of their highest-paid hourly salespeople—not to trim the workforce, as you might expect, but to replace those let go with lower-paid workers—along comes the Labor Department with equally startling news, but of a positive bent.

In March, the U.S. economy added 180,000 jobs; the unemployment rate declined again, to 4.4 percent; and average hourly and weekly earnings advanced, with weekly income up 4.4 percent on an annual basis.

In other words, amid all of the economic anxiety fueled by globalization, immigration and the relentless rhetoric about a growing class divide in the United States, the actual performance of the American economy remains fairly remarkable.

We're not suggesting that the popular worries are baseless. Globalization involves winners and losers; immigration puts pressure on wages (at least on the lower end); and the rich have indeed been getting richer at a faster rate than the rest of us.

Even some of the popular resentments—such as over the steep trajectory of CEO pay—are hardly without merit.

But after six years of fairly steady economic growth despite a costly war, Katrina, a housing slump and other body blows, fair-minded people should at least entertain the possibility that current policies must be getting something right.

The burden of proof, indeed, should be on those who want to raise taxes, reverse advances in free trade, and micromanage businesses with a slew of new regulations affecting compensation, benefits and employment conditions.

After all, what exactly is it about the March economic figures that they don't like?

ENERGY

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, what I really came to address is an issue of utmost importance to the American people. When I visit my home State and read the mail I receive from constituents, I am consistently reminded of the fact that we are seeing record-high energy prices. High energy prices affect almost every American. They affect the parent who drives his or her kids to school. They affect the college student who wants to make it home for the weekend. They affect Members of the Senate as we travel to and from our States. But we have to be careful with what we do. A lot of the time, something that we think is going to be a positive move turns out to be a negative.

I refer to a Wall Street Journal article of May 16, 2007. It is titled "Green But Unclean." It reads:

Remember those water-saving toilets that Congress mandated a few years back? Yes, the ones that frequently clog and don't flush, causing many Americans to resort to buying high-performance, black-marketed potties in Canada and sneaking them into their homes like smugglers. Well, get set for Washington's latest brainstorm.

I ask unanimous consent to print this article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 16, 2007]

GREEN BUT UNCLEAN

Remember those water-saving toilets that Congress mandated a few years back? Yes, the ones that frequently clog and don't flush, causing many Americans to resort to buying high-performance black-market potties in Canada and sneaking them into their homes like smugglers. Well, get set for Washington's latest brainstorm: \$800 washers that don't really clean.

The June issue of Consumer Reports states that "Not so long ago you could count on most washers to get your clothes clean. Not anymore. . . ." The magazine tested the new washers and found that "Some left our stain-soaked swatches nearly as dirty as they were before washing."

The cause of this dirty laundry is a regulation issued in the waning days of the Clinton Administration mandating that washers use 35% less energy by 2007. Regulators claimed at the time that this would save money and energy without sacrificing performance. That's what they always say. But, according to Consumer Reports, the new top-loading washers "had some of the lowest scores we've seen in years."

Don't expect apologies from Congress or the green activists who promoted these mandates. We are living in one of those eras where all Americans are supposed to bow before the gods of energy conservation, even if it means walking around with dirty underwear. One irony is that because the new machines clean so poorly, consumers will often have to rewash clothes, which could well offset energy savings from the mandates. Not to mention the use of extra detergent. But no matter: Crusades like these are about pure green intentions, not the impure actual results.

And this is just the beginning. President Bush's endorsement of more immediate auto-mileage standards this week is the latest sign that we are returning to the era when the environment is used as the political justification to promote a new wave of government regulation.

Members of Congress and state legislatures are proposing new government edicts forcing Americans to use new and more energy-efficient fluorescent light bulbs instead of the conventional incandescent bulbs that many people prefer. Apparently Americans aren't wise enough to make up their own minds, as technology adapts and prices of the new bulbs fall.

Once upon a time liberals said government should stay out of the bedroom; at the current rate, that will be the only room in the house where Uncle Sam won't be telling us how to live.

Mr. ENZI. Price increases are for a number of reasons, but the simplest explanation is that we lack the supply to meet the demand for energy. At the same time, prices decrease when we see strong supplies that are capable of meeting the demand that exists.

We have to be careful that we reduce the demand—and that is what part of this bill does—but we also have to figure out a way to increase the supply. I am a little disappointed in what the bill does with that.

On June 12, 2007, there was an article in the Casper Star-Tribune. The title is "Official warns of energy crisis; Growth in demand for electricity in West exceeds generation capacity." Of course, for years we have been hearing about rolling brownouts in California and even blackouts in part of the country.

It says:

Construction of new electrical generation in the West is projected to grow by 6 percent, while demand for electricity is projected to increase by 19 percent over the next 10 years, according to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

FERC Commissioner Suede Kelly, speaking on her own behalf, said the situation is nothing short of a crisis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Casper Star-Tribune, June 12, 2007]

OFFICIAL WARNS OF ENERGY CRISIS (By Dustin Bleizeffer)

DEADWOOD, S.D.—Construction of new electrical generation in the West is projected to grow by 6 percent, while demand for electricity is projected to increase by 19 percent over the next 10 years, according to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

FERC commissioner Suede Kelly, speaking on her own behalf, said the situation is nothing short of a crisis.

"There's not enough time to build our way out," Kelly told the Western Governors' Association here Monday.

Kelly said Western states must band together to aggressively seek energy efficiency, noting that even small load reductions during peak usage times have proven to save millions of dollars. In addition to efficiency, Kelly said, Western states must immediately launch a massive and coordinated construction effort to link rural renewable energy and clean coal resources to high-load centers.

She commended the Western Governors' Association for its efforts toward those goals, but cautioned that the process is going to be expensive—both financially and politically. The political cost is that some government entity—whether state or federal—is going to have to force power lines into someone's backyard.

States retain authority over siting power lines and related facilities—an endowment the federal government doesn't seem to envy, according to Kelly. Wyoming Gov. Dave Freudenthal suggested this is one area where the federal government could be useful. Freudenthal's idea: Perhaps FERC could play some sort of "convenor" role to "legitimize" siting authority.

"The governor feels really what the state can do is set the stage and make the case that transmission is important," Freudenthal spokeswoman Cara Eastwood said. "It's a complex issue, and it's a challenging issue that has to be overcome in some way."

Individual states can invite FERC to participate without relinquishing siting authority, Kelly said. She said open co-operation is key to dealing with the energy crisis, so Westerners are going to have to accept "small environmental footprints" to reduce the overall environmental footprint across the nation.

"We are no longer flying solo with our electricity supply and demand," Kelly said. "We are dependent on each other—even more dependent on each other if we want to (develop) our renewable and clean coal" resources.

Kelly said the energy shortfall will likely reveal itself this summer, noting that meteorologists project hot temperatures across the nation.

"We can correctly call this a crisis," Kelly said. "We don't have enough time to build generation to meet increased demand this summer."

Mr. ENZI. As prices continue to escalate, some would say we are in an energy crisis. We are at a point where we continue to see the global demand for energy increasing as countries such as China and India develop. At the same time, the demand increases, the Democratic Congress is not taking the steps to increase our domestic supply. Some of the policies we are seeing will have a detrimental effect on that supply.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 included a number of important incentives for the domestic exploration of many new natural resource supplies. It aided in the production of affordable domestic energy. We are now seeing a number of proposals from the other side to repeal these important provisions.

In the 109th Congress, we attempted to pass important legislation to streamline the bureaucratic process

that made it impossible to build an entirely new refinery, and that is what has been happening for the last 30 years. That legislation was repeatedly blocked at the expense of the American people, who continue to suffer as refiners struggle to keep pace through expansion. Supply and demand—you can buy the oil, but unless the oil becomes gasoline, you cannot use it, and unless it is in enough of a quantity of gasoline and enough of a supply, the price will go up. It will provide complications.

Since November, gasoline prices have increased almost 50 percent. The price of gas averaged \$2.20 a gallon at the last election. Now the average is \$3.15 a gallon. Part of that is the cost of a barrel of oil, but more of that is a reflection on the future and how unstable some of the world situations are. That is what fluctuates the price of a barrel of oil.

But the price at the pump is affected by the number of refineries we have and the number of regulations Congress puts on the gasoline we use. We saw a spike last month in the price of gasoline. That is the point at which the refineries had to shut down some of their production in order to change over to the requirements we put on for the summer fuel. When that happens, there is less supply, and prices go up. Since the changeover has been made, prices have come down slightly.

These are not positive trends and, unfortunately, there is nothing to indicate the Senate will be acting in a way to increase supply and improve the price of energy for the American people.

My State of Wyoming is an energy-producing State. We produce about a third of the Nation's coal. We produce a million tons of coal a day. We also have large natural gas fields. We are the only State in the Nation that is showing an increasing supply of natural gas. We also produce some oil. We have a significant amount of wind power. We have uranium. Because of a lot of Sun, I am seeing an increasing amount of solar power with each visit to Wyoming.

We have a diversified energy portfolio. We have an energy portfolio that recognizes that coal is the Nation's most abundant resource. In fact, my county has more Btu's in coal than Saudi Arabia has in oil. Our energy portfolio recognizes you can produce natural gas in an environmentally efficient manner. At the same time, our State's portfolio recognizes there is an increasingly important place for wind and other renewable resources. We are trying to do them all, but we cannot neglect the one we have the most of.

The policies on the other side of the aisle do not reflect this need for diversity. While they talk about the need to reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources, they repeatedly block efforts to produce our domestic resources. As they talk about the need to lower prices for consumers, they advocate policies that will make it more ex-

pensive to produce energy. As they talk about the need to increase our Nation's energy security, they vote against policies that will increase the use of our Nation's most abundant domestic energy source.

We are currently debating an energy bill. I want to commend Chairman BINGAMAN and Ranking Member DOMENICI for their work on this legislation. There is no question there are some positive provisions in the legislation. I do appreciate that it actually came through committee. I have not seen a bill that has just been brought to the floor, such as the immigration bill, that has ever made it through the process. So this one has a chance of making it through, and I am glad for that. The legislation will help develop biofuels technologies which will allow us to displace some of our Nation's traditional energy supply.

However, the legislation has many flaws, most clearly illustrated by the decision of Senate Democrats to block efforts by members of the Energy Committee who worked to incentivize a technology that can truly reduce our Nation's dependence on foreign sources. That technology is known as coal-to-liquids, and it is the process of turning our Nation's most abundant energy source—coal—into liquid fuels—incentives instead of stopping the process.

Coal-to-liquids technology is not new. The technology has been around since the 1940s, and there is no question it will be used today in a much better way than even in the 1940s. It would be used in the transportation markets, which is our biggest difficulty.

It can be transported in pipelines that currently exist. And, because it comes from coal—our Nation's most abundant energy source—it can be produced at home by American workers.

Coal-to-liquids plants are being developed in China. They are being developed in other major industrialized nations, but they are not being developed in the United States. I am concerned that, as we sit on the sidelines, other nations will take advantage of our inaction and our economy will suffer.

The amendment offered by Senators THOMAS and BUNNING that was blocked in the Energy Committee offered a tremendous opportunity to move coal-to-liquids forward. It was a tremendous opportunity to place more of our energy security in the hands of Americans and to take it out of the hands of Hugo Chavez of Venezuela and other oil barons who seek to do economic harm to the United States. Unfortunately, on a party-line vote, that effort was blocked and instead of debating a more comprehensive energy bill, we are debating one with a glaring weakness.

In addition to the decision to keep coal-to-liquids language out of the legislation, I am concerned that a number of other sections included in the bill make for good talking points, but not for good solutions. Although I understand and sympathize with the problems that high energy prices create for

families, creating a federal price gouging law is not the answer. The authority already exists for investigations into price gouging, and I am concerned that price gouging is simply a code word for "price controls." Such a policy failed in the past and will fail in the future.

I also have concerns about the sections of the legislation that increase corporate average fuel economy standards, and I have concerns that this bill does nothing to address our lack of domestic energy production in areas where production is possible and environmentally responsible.

We are in a situation where our Nation's energy supply does not meet our Nation's energy demand, and, while we must work to reduce our consumption, we should also work to produce as much energy domestically as is possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of America's energy security, and I wish to speak a moment about the bill that is before us and talk about some of the pluses it brings into our debate and also talk about some additions I think are very necessary.

I am very excited that the Energy Committee, which I am on, has passed out to this body a bill that talks about increasing the ability of our country to rely upon alternative fuels. I think we have set some very good goals in that area. I believe that is an excellent start to cause us to be less dependent on petroleum, to be far more dependent on biofuels in our country.

I know the State of Tennessee, which I proudly represent, will be a big part of making sure that happens. As a matter of fact, our State is working to make sure we are a substantial part of our country's goal in meeting these objectives.

I know cellulosic research is taking place in Tennessee and throughout the country, which will benefit all Americans in the process, as we take the pressure off corn-based ethanol, which is a big part of what we are doing in our country. I am so thrilled for the corn farmers and others across America who are playing a part in our energy future, but I know that cellulosic is going to be a big part of what we need to do to even increase our country's ability to produce alternative fuels.

I also know this bill we are contemplating does a great deal to focus on carbon capture and storage. It also allows our country to actually assess the various caverns throughout our country to really look at how much storage capacity our country has as it relates to storing CO₂ emissions in order to make sure we do no further damage to our environment.

I know this bill also really focuses on energy efficiency standards—something all Americans need to embrace.

Certainly, the Federal Government needs to be a leader in that area, and this bill certainly contemplates that.

But let me say this: In a rush to do this—and I am, again, thrilled we have a bipartisan effort underway—I think we need not lose sight of the fact that overall our goal should be to certainly make sure whatever we do with energy policy raises the gross domestic product of our country over time, so these young people who are here as pages today have a future that is even brighter than it is today, that what we do certainly causes our country to have energy security so we are not dependent on regimes around the world that are not friendly to our country, and that whatever we do causes us to be environmental stewards, that we do not damage our country.

I want to tell you that I had the great privilege of spending time in Europe 2 weeks ago, looking at some of the energy policies some of our friends and allies have put in place. While on one hand I admire greatly their effort to do less damage to the environment, sometimes there are adverse consequences to what occurs. I think what we have seen over the short term is a greater dependence on fuel sources that will cause them to be in some ways more dependent on regimes that could not in some ways be friendly to their future.

I think we need to keep these things in balance. So while we look at alternative fuels that are going to be friendly to our environment and cause us to be less dependent on those that are not, I think we ought to also focus heavily, in this bill, on increased production. Here in America, we need to do our best to boost fuel supply by increased production. We need to increase our refining capacity. We really have not had major increases in refining capacity in this country since the 1970s. There are additions that are taking place.

I know many people are talking about the high price of gasoline. Certainly, one of the reasons for that is our country has a limited ability to actually refine petroleum in a way we can use it in our vehicles. That is something we as a country need to aggressively pursue.

The other thing we need to do in this bill—and I plan to offer an amendment to deal with this issue. In some ways, in this bill, in focusing on alternative fuels, we are trying to pick winners and losers. We are saying certain types of ethanol are the types of alternative fuels we need to be pursuing and those only. What I would like to do is add—and what I will do through an amendment, and hopefully, it will pass this body—is to cause the Senate to actually set standards, standards that cause fuels to be environmentally friendly, to emit less carbon, to emit less other types of pollutants, and at the same time be fuel efficient, to provide the amount of energy, if you will, that really meets the standards these

other fuels do. So we hope to broaden that definition so the Senate itself is not defining specific fuels.

We have tremendous capabilities in our country through entrepreneurship. We have tremendous capabilities through coal-to-liquid technology that we can do in an environmentally friendly way. We have other types of technologies that are being developed. I think we as a country should set goals and standards and let entrepreneurs and the business community help fill the void to cause our country to be energy secure, to cause our country to help grow the GDP, and to cause our country to make sure what we do causes us to be environmentally friendly.

So we will be putting forth that amendment. I hope my colleagues will join me in helping us broaden these definitions so we can harness the very best we have in our country.

I yield my time.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCASKILL). Morning business is closed.

CREATING LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE NATION ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 6, which the clerk will report by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 1502, in the nature of a substitute.

Inhofe amendment No. 1505 (to amendment No. 1502), to improve domestic fuels security.

AMENDMENT NO. 1505

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:45 a.m. shall be for debate on amendment No. 1505, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, with the time equally divided and controlled between the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, and the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, or their designees.

Who yields time?

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, on behalf of Senator INHOFE, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise to talk about the Inhofe amendment, which would increase the possibility that we could have increased refining in the United States. Refining of oil